

Applicant: Wang et al.  
Application No. 10/762,935  
Page 4

NE9956CIP

**Proposed Amendments to the Drawings**

Please see the attached replacement drawing sheet, which changes "Fig. 1" to "Fig. 1 (Prior Art)."

Applicant: Wang et al.  
Application No. 10/762,935  
Page 7

NE9956CIP

### REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4-6, and have added new claim 9. Care has been taken to avoid adding new matter. Claims 1-9 are presently pending in the application.

The Office Action objected to claims 1, 5 and 6 as allegedly containing informalities, and rejected claims 2, 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In response, Applicants have incorporated changes into claims 1, 5 and 6 to address the objections, and submit the following comments regarding the rejection. In connection with the rejection of claim 2, Applicants submit that instructions directed to a player "regarding the time to display said reaction" would appear to be nonsensical so that the instructions would, instead, need to be machine readable code since the machine would be responsible for displaying reactions rather than the player. In connection with the rejection of claim 3, the Office Action stated that the language in claim 1 "wherein said intended receiver ... to react to said reaction" contradicts the language in claim 1 of "said interceptor ... to react to said action." Applicants respectfully submit, however, that these two clauses do not pertain to the same item; rather one pertains to a "reaction" and one pertains to an "action." The "action" is not the same as the "reaction," since, for example, the former is recited in the claim as being associated with the interceptor and the latter is recited in the claim as being initiated by the initiator. Accordingly, there would appear not to be any inconsistency in the queried language. Based upon the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the above-mentioned objections and rejections.

Regarding the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaaaj (U.S. Patent No. 6,056,640), Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's reasoning in view of the claims as currently amended.

Independent claim 1 has been amended as set forth above. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it relates to the claims even before the present amendment but especially after this amendment.

Applicant: Wang et al.  
Application No. 10/762,935  
Page 8

NE9956CIP

Regarding the outstanding rejection, it is well established that a claim can be rejected on obviousness grounds only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior-art reference or combination of prior-art references. Thus, for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to be proper, every limitation recited in a claim, which is rejected as being obvious in view of a combination of prior-art references, must be disclosed or taught in that collection of prior-art references. In the instant case, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference neither discloses nor suggests each and every element that is recited in the rejected claims. Accordingly, as set forth below, the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that Schaaïj neither discloses nor suggests a method of compensating for network latency in an online multiplayer game requiring more than two participants, wherein the client structure of the game utilizes at least one server, including, among other things, “conveying an occurrence of an action, which is initiated by said initiator and directed to said intended receiver, first to said interceptor, wherein said interceptor becomes aware of said action first and has the initial opportunity to react to said action, and wherein a reaction by said interceptor results in an outcome signal; and conveying said outcome signal to each of said initiator, intended receiver and interceptor at a specific time for each, wherein each of said initiator, intended receiver and interceptor will witness the reaction concurrently,” as recited in independent, amended claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims, including new dependent claim 9, are allowable at least because of their dependencies upon independent, amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant: Wang et al.  
Application No. 10/762,935  
Page 9

NE9956CIP

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of same is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions

Respectfully submitted,



Kenton R. Mullins  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,331

Dated: September 7, 2006

STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS, LLP  
4 Venture, Suite 300  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Tel: 949-450-1750  
Fax: 949-450-1764